UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/554,912	10/31/2005	Hiroyuki Fukui	Q91216	9744

65565 7590 08/18/2011

SUGHRUE-265550
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVE. NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20037-3213

EXAMINER	
JONES, MARCUS D	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3717	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/18/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

SUGHRUE265550@SUGHRUE.COM
USPTO@SUGHRUE.COM
PPROCESSING@SUGHRUE.COM

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/554,912	FUKUI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MARCUS JONES	3717	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *3 June 2011*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on _____; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.

4)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

5)☒ Claim(s) *1-14* is/are pending in the application.

5a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

6)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

7)☒ Claim(s) *1-14* is/are rejected.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

9)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

10)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

11)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

The amendment filed 3 June 2011 in response to the previous Non-Final Office Action (7 March 2011) is acknowledged and has been entered.

Claims 1-14 are currently pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 2 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Suganuma et al. (US PGPub 2003/0130034).

In reference to claim 1, Suganuma discloses: A gaming machine, comprising:

a plurality of individual reels, each of which variably presents a plurality of symbols (see Figure 4, leads 6a-6c);

a cover body (see Figure 1, lead line 20, *housing*), covering the reels and formed with a plurality of observation windows, each of which is associated with one of different parts in each of the individual reels (see Figures 2 and 4, lead line 1p and 1g, *where the reels are disposed inside the top box, and reflect an image of symbols from the individual reels that are visible on the lower half of the display*); and

a controller, operable to execute a game and exclusively allow one of the different parts in each of the individual reels to be viewed through an associated one of the plurality of observation windows in accordance with a condition of the game (see Figure 5,lead line 10a CPU).

In reference to claim 2, Suganuma discloses the invention substantially as claimed. Suganuma further discloses one set of mechanical reels (design reels) 6a, 6b, 6c (see FIG. 4) which have designs 6an, 6bn, 6cn drawn on their peripheries (par 62).

In reference to claim 14, Suganuma discloses: A gaming machine, comprising:

a plurality of individual reels, each of which variably presents a plurality of symbols (see Figure 4, leads 6a-6c);

a cover body (see Figure 1, lead line 20, *housing*), coving the plurality of reels and formed with a plurality of observation windows, each of said observation windows being associated with a respective one part of plural different parts in each of the individual reels (see Figure 2, lead line 1p and 1g);

a controller, operable to execute a game and exclusively allow one of the different parts in each of the individual reels to be viewed through an associated one of the plurality of observation windows in accordance with a condition of the game (see Figure 5, lead line 10a CPU).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. Claims 3-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suganuma, and further in view of Kinoshita et al. (Japanese Patent Application 6-105943).

In reference to claim 3, Suganuma discloses observation windows including first and second observation windows (see Figure 2, lead lines 1p and 1g) where symbols are viewed using visual light, but not symbols visible with ultra violet light. Kinoshita teaches a first light source, disposed inside the reels to emit visible light; and a second light source, disposed outside the reels to emit ultraviolet light (pg 14, par 27 and 29, *white lamp and ultraviolet ray lamp, can also be provided not only inside the cabinet but inside each reel*).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Suganuma in view of Kinoshita in order to make the game more exciting for the player by using UV lighting effects.

In reference to claims 4 and 5, Suganuma and Kinoshita disclose the invention substantially as claimed. Suganuma further discloses: a mirror member, which provides reflected virtual images as the first symbols viewed through the first observation window and wherein the mirror member is a half mirror, so that the image provided by the display and transmitted through the half mirror is superposed on each of the reflected virtual images, as the first symbols viewed through the first observation window (par 82 and Figure 2, lead line 1m).

In reference to claim 6, Suganuma and Kinoshita disclose the invention substantially as claimed. Suganuma further discloses wherein each of the first symbols is provided on the outer periphery of each of the reels as an inversion image (par 125).

4. In reference to claims 7 and 8, Suganuma and Kinoshita disclose the invention substantially as claimed. Suganuma further discloses wherein the game includes a first game, and a second game activated in accordance with a result of the first game and wherein the second game is activated in a case where the first symbols viewed through the first observation window are matched with a first predetermined pattern when the reels are stopped (par 70).

5. **Claims 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suganuma and Kinoshita, and further in view of JP 2001-054612 (hereinafter JP '612).**

In reference to claim 9, Suganuma and Kinoshita disclose the invention substantially as claimed except for turning the UV light on during the bonus game.. JP

'612 teaches that the ultraviolet light is turned on during the bonus game, which may be a lottery (par 16 and par 51).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Suganuma and Kinoshita in view of JP '612 in order to make the bonus game visually appealing by using the UV-lit symbols

In reference to claim 10, Suganuma, Kinoshita and JP '612 disclose the invention substantially as claimed. JP '612 further teaches a maximum number of bonus games (*casting lots*) to be played, the odds of winning the lottery and the predetermined pattern to win (par 36-37).

In reference to claim 11, Suganuma, Kinoshita and JP '612 disclose the invention substantially as claimed. JP '612 further teaches that the symbols visible by ultraviolet light are around the peripheral of the rotation reel and are in a blank state when the ultraviolet light is not on (par 17-18).

6. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suganuma, Kinoshita and JP '612, and further in view of Dickenson et al. (US 5,251,898).

In reference to claim 12, Suganuma, Kinoshita and JP '612 disclose the invention substantially as claimed but fail to teach that the reels spin in different directions. Dickenson teaches a gaming apparatus with bi-directional reels in which the reels randomly rotate in different directions (see at least col 3 and 4).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Suganuma, Kinoshita and JP '612 to include the

random-direction reels of Dickenson in order to provide game features that increase player interest and enjoyments, as is favorably described in Dickenson (col 1, ln 18-22). The Examiner notes that Dickenson provides a showing that is was known in the art to allow the reels to spin in a bottom-to-top direction, which renders the limitations of claim 12 an obvious matter of aesthetic design choice since it does not change the outcome of the game.

7. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suganuma and Kinoshita, and further in view of JP 2002-200243 (hereinafter JP '243).

In reference to claim 13, Suganuma and Kinoshita disclose the invention substantially as claimed except reducing the light amount transmitted. JP '243 further teaches reducing the volume of light to increase visibility of an image (par 80).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Suganuma and Kinoshita in order to increase the visibility of an image (*JP '243*, par 80).

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MARCUS JONES whose telephone number is (571)270-3773. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5 EST, Alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Melba Bumgarner can be reached on 571-272-4709. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Marcus D. Jones/
Examiner, Art Unit 3717

/Melba Bumgarner/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3717